learned Conservator who has special knowledge of the subject was written to at my instance and he has made some suggestions. Further information will be called for and all possible steps taken towards the discovery of some remedy for the disease. Government hope to do this in the course of the year and if this is not found feasible the question of what other relief could be granted to the ryots will be considered.

21. Suggestions regarding the number of kist instalments.

Mr. Narayanan Madhavan Karthavu (*Shertallay*) said that the order of Government dated 25th July 1906 reducing the number of kist instalments from 10 to 6 worked hardship on the ryots and prayed that as before 10 instalments might be allowed for the payment of tax.

Mr. K. Karunakaran Pillai (*Parur*) *and Mr. P. N. Kesava Pillai* (*Quilon*) also pleaded for a reversion to the old arrangement.

Mr. R. Nambi Iyer (*Tovala*) requested that the 6 instalments now in vogue should be further reduced to 4 *viz.*, in the months of Thulam, Vrichigom, Meenam and Medom.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (*Kalkulam*) said that the present number of instalments did not admit of further reduction. He observed that the majority of ryots were poor and that it would be an advantage to them if there were more instalments for the recovery of tax. The Revenue Recovery Regulation demanded interest in cases of arrears of tax and a reduction in the number of instalments would mean further loss to the cultivator in the shape of interest. The member added that the present arrangement which was only recently introduced might be given a fair trial before any further reduction was made.

Mr. M. K. Govinda Pillai B. A., B. L. (*Trivandrum*) supported the views of Mr. Madhavan Tampi.

Reply.—The question is a difficult one. You yourselves are not agreed, such difference of opinion being probably due to differences in local conditions and circumstances. The matter is under the consideration of Government in reference to the Report of the Survey Committee and the opinions of the officers concerned have been called for. Earnest consideration will be given to your valuable remarks. Government hope to arrive at a decision satisfactory to all the Divisions, consistently with the general principle not to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

harass the people and have an establishment from one end of the year to the other and to realize the revenue at the time when the ryots are likely to get the produce in their hands and before they dispose of it or consume it away. These points will be borne in mind and early orders passed.

22. Commutation of the paddy portion of the tax on Sreepandaravagai and Sreepadom lands into money at 11 chs. per parah.

Mr. K. Padmanabhan Tampi (*Taluk Association, Kalkulam*) represented that the recent proceedings of Government commuting paddy tax into money at 11 chs. per parah was not extended to the Sreepandaravagai lands and as such the value of the latter considerably declined in the eyes of the public. He said that Government were well aware of the inconvenience of tax-payment in kind and that it was a grievance to the holders of Sreepandaravagai lands that, while the tax on all the other Devaswom lands assumed by the Sirkar could now be paid in money, they alone should have to continue to be paying in grain. It was not difficult to find contractors for the supply of rice for Devaswoms maintained from the Sreepandaravagai funds and as a matter of fact, the Sreepandaravagai ryots even now paid their tax only in money at the market rate after receipt of demand notice. The member therefore prayed that the relief now afforded by Government to the holders of Sirkar lands might be extended to the ryots enjoying Sreepandaravagai lands also.

Mr. R. Nambi Iyer (*Tovala*) spoke in support of Mr. Padmanabhan Tampi.

Mr. Mathevan Kesavan (*Neyyattinkara*) said that in his taluk there were too many Sreepandaravagai and Kandukrishi lands and unless the paddy tax on them was converted into money at 11 chs. per parah, much benefit would not accrue to the ryots from the recent Proceedings of Government.

Mr. Kanakku Mathevan Kesavan (*Neyyattinkara*) spoke in support of the same view.

Mr. P. Raman Tampi B. A., M. L., (*Trivandrum*) requested that the benefit of the recent Proceedings of Government should be made applicable to both Sreepandaravagai and Sreepadom lands.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (*Kalkulam*) stated that so far as management and revenue recovery were concerned the Sreepadom

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly